

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

In re DERRICK HINES,
d/b/a THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;
THE UNITED STATES, a Federal Municipal
Corporation; THE STATE OF MICHIGAN;
Region 6, a Political Subdivision of Michigan;
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Case No. 18-50915

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Derrick Hines, proceeding pro se, has filed a document styled as a “Government Notice of Removal and Lawful Order.” (Dkt. #1.) He has also filed a “Government Notice of Removal Intent to Execute.” (Dkt. #2.) For the following reasons, this case will be dismissed.

The filed documents are in large part nonsensical. From the case caption he has created, Derrick Hines seems to represent that he is bringing suit on behalf of the state and federal government. He addresses his documents to some unidentified third parties and demands money that he apparently gave to them. (See, e.g., Dkt. #1 (“You have 5 days to return funds that you are obligated to and that is due the Government through the State.”).) He uses legal terminology in support of his apparent power to order the return of his money. (See, e.g., Dkt. #1 (“I have personal and subject matter dominion, power and authority over CREDIT ACCEPTANCE CORPORATION and any subsidiaries assigned and affiliates. I got a blank check and a blanket contract and I can write in anything I want.”).) But if there is some legal basis on which Mr. Hines might

proceed in this manner, he has not identified it and the court is unaware of any. The court is mindful of its obligation to liberally construe complaints by pro se litigants. See *Jourdan v. Jabe*, 951 F.2d 108, 110 (6th Cir. 1991). But it is not required furnish additional factual allegations or legal bases where none presently exist—to do so would improperly transform the court into an advocate for the plaintiff. *Thompson v. A.J. Rose Mfg. Co.*, No. 99-3728, 2000 WL 302998, at *1 (6th Cir. 2000).

At least one other Judge in this District has dismissed a similar case filed by Mr. Hines as frivolous. See *In re Derrick Hines*, 18-50562, Dkt. #3 (E.D. Mich. Apr. 26, 2018) (Cohn, J.). The court likewise finds that these filings are frivolous and this case is appropriately dismissed. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the “Notice of Removal and Lawful Order” (Dkt. #1) is DISMISSED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the “Notice of Removal and Intent to Execute” is DISMISSED.

s/Robert H. Cleland
ROBERT H. CLELAND
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: August 9, 2018

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, August 9, 2018, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Lisa Wagner
Case Manager and Deputy Clerk
(810) 292-6522